

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,440	12/12/2003	Fabian Kollmann	3201-366 (D4700-00380)	2028
75	7590 06/16/2005		EXAMINER	
STEPHAN P. GRIBOK			PHILLIPS, CHARLES E	
DUANE MORRIS LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PHILADELPH	PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u></u>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/735,440	KOLLMANN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Charles E. Phillips	3751
The MAILING DATE of this communication riod for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thir ririod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become At	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
atus		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _	•	
	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo		ters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und		
sposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application	on.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.	1
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.	
oplication Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐		
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner, note the attache	u Office Action of John PTO-152.
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		i received in this National Stage
application from the International Bu		received
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	inscortine certified copies flot	i icuciveu.
ttachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗀 Interview	Summary (PTO-413)
INA MORCE OF METERETICES CITED (F. LO-032)	السا (ب	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/04,5/04,3/05.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

6) Other: _

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/735,440

Art Unit: 3751

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "to unity" of the last line of claim 1 is not understood, what does it mean?

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Where is the support for this claim, i.e., "normal to the surface" and "diameter of the surface"?

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas et al.

Art Unit: 3751

The length of stem 46 looks approximately equal to the diameter of the showerhead 40. The claim 3 fitting is seen at 64 in Fig. 1.

Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP20000037 641. The claimed parameters appear met by the head 1 with handle 10 and connection to hose 12.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al and EP 2000037641, either in view of DE 19942853.

To provide the former with an oval shape as taught by the latter at 1 would have constituted an obvious expedient of choice in design.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Charles Phillips at telephone number 571-272-4893.

Charles E. Phillips
Primary Examiner